UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/828,550	04/21/2004	Daniel R. Neal	WFS.006CIP	5453	
	7590 10/10/200 & WHITT PLLC	7	EXAMINER		
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE 11951 FREEDOM DRIVE SUITE 1260			STULTZ, JESSICA T		
RESTON, VA		50	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2873		
		·			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/10/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			4
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	U
	10/828,550	NEAL ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jessica T. Stultz	2873	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	;
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communi ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23	3 July 2007.		
	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the mer	its is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-47 and 51-55</u> is/are pending in t	he application:		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-17,38-41,46 and</u>	•	m consideration.	
5) Claim(s) 29-37,42-45 and 47 is/are allowed			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>18-28</u> is/are rejected.	•		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.		
Application Papers	·		
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are:		ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to		•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawin	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-15	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	oian priority under 35 U.S.C.	8 119(a)-(d) or (f)	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	ight phonty under 66 6.6.6.	3 110(a) (a) 01 (1).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p			e
application from the International Bur	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		,
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	ot received.	•
*			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 0404.	6) Other:		

Art Unit: 2873

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 18-37, 42-45, and 47 in the reply filed on July 23, 2007 is acknowledged. Claims 1-17, 38-41, 46, and 51-55 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Groups I and III, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on July 23, 2007.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph 1, "patent application 10/369,513, filed on 21 February 2003, the" should be "patent application 10/369,513, filed on 21 February 2003, now US patent 6,908,196, the". Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

Art Unit: 2873

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPO 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 18-28 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 10, 17-21, and 23-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,550,917, herein referred to as Neal et al '917. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 18-28 of the instant application are anticipated or made obvious by claims 1-2, 10, 18-21, and 23-24 of Neal et al '917.

Regarding claim 18, Neal et al '917 discloses a system for measuring an optical characteristic of an optically transmissive object, comprising: a projecting optical system which projects light through an optically transmissive object (Claim 1, wherein light is projected to a the retina of the eye, i.e. and optically transmissive object); a correction system adapted to at least partially compensate a light beam that has been projected through the object for at least one

Art Unit: 2873

optical property of the object (Claim 1); an imaging system adapted to collect the light that has been projected through the object; and a wavefront sensor adapted to receive the light collected by the imaging system and to sense a wavefront of the received light (Claim 1).

Regarding claim 19, Neal et al '917 discloses wherein the object is a lens and the optical property that the correction system compensates for is a focal power of the lens (Claim 10).

Regarding claim 20, Neal et al '917 discloses means for adjusting the compensation applied to the light beam by the correction system (Claims 18-21).

Regarding claim 21, Neal et al '917 discloses the limitations therein (Claim 2).

Regarding claim 22, Neal et al '917 discloses the limitations therein (Claim 23).

Regarding claim 23, Neal et al '917 discloses that the correction system includes at least one variable focal length lens (Claim 17, wherein the correction system is a telescope, i.e. having variable focal length).

Regarding claim 24, Neal et al '917 discloses the limitations therein (Claims 18-21).

Regarding claim 25, Neal et al '917 discloses that t the correction system comprises a telescope having two lenses, at least one of said lenses being movable (Claim 17, wherein the correction system is a telescope, i.e. thereby having two lenses, at least one being movable).

Regarding claims 26-28, Neal et al '917 discloses the limitations therein (Claims 18-21 and 23-24).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 29-37, 42-45, and 47 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowable subject matter: none of the prior art alone or in combination disclose or teach of the claimed combination of limitations

Art Unit: 2873

to warrant a rejection under 35 USC 102 or 103.

Specifically regarding independent claim 29, none of the prior art alone or in combination disclose or teach of a method of measuring an optical quality of an optically transmissive object as disclosed, specifically comprising the steps of at least partially compensating a light beam that has been projected through the object for the optical property of the object and sensing a wavefront of collected light at a wavefront sensor.

Specifically regarding independent claim 42, none of the prior art alone or in combination disclose or teach of a method of measuring an optical quality of an optically transmissive object as disclosed, specifically comprising the steps of collecting light passed through a portion of the object and sensing at a wavefront sensor a wavefront of collected light passed through the portion of the object, repeating these steps for a plurality of different portions of the object that together span a target area of the object, and stitching together the sensed wavefronts to produce a complete measurement of the target area of the object.

Specifically regarding independent claim 47, none of the prior art alone or in combination disclose or teach of a method of measuring an optical quality of an optically transmissive object as disclosed, specifically comprising the steps of sensing a wavefront comprising a difference between a wavefront of a collected light and a reference wavefront; changing the distance between the light source and the object; repeating these steps to produce N sensed wavefronts; and stitching together the N sensed wavefronts to produce a complete measurement of the target area of the surface of the object.

Art Unit: 2873

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. MacDonald et al US 5,136,413, Neal et al US 6,547,395, and Oono et al US 5,991,102 are cited as having some similar structure to the claimed invention since they disclose optical systems including a projecting optical system and a wavefront sensor.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jessica T. Stultz whose telephone number is (571) 272-2339. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Mack can be reached on 571-272-2333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jessica T Stultz

Examiner

Art Unit 2873

October 1, 2007